

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Jarode J.D.L. Witherspoon, # 247462,)	Civil Action No. 9:17-1027-MGL-BM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
)	
Nurse Jones, Full Name Unknown, SIA)	
Wing on Kirkland Yard and M. Miley)	
Mental Health,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The pro se Plaintiff brought this action seeking relief pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. On November 7, 2017, the Defendant Miley filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim.¹ As the Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, a Roseboro Order was entered by the Court on November 8, 2017, advising Plaintiff of the importance of a dispositive motion and of the need for him to file an adequate response. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to file a properly supported response, the Defendant's motion may be granted, thereby ending his case. However, notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions as set forth in the Court's Roseboro

¹The Defendant Jones has never been served with process. See Court Docket No. 24. By Order filed October 19, 2017, Plaintiff was advised that additional information was needed to serve Defendant Jones. Plaintiff thereafter submitted a filing on October 31, 2017, which may or may not have been intended to respond to the Court's Order. Exactly what the intention of Plaintiff's filing was, however, is unclear, as it can best be characterized by what some courts have described as "buzzwords" or "legalistic gibberish". See, e.g., Rochester v. McKie, No. 8:11-797, 2011 WL 2671228, at *1 (D.S.C. July 8, 2011) (citing Yocum v. Summers, No. 91-3648, 1991 WL 171389, at *1 (N.D.Ill. Aug. 30, 1991)). In any event, this filing did not provide the service or location information necessary to effectuate service on the Defendant Jones.

order, the Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion, or to contact the Court in any way.

Based on the foregoing, the undersigned finds that Plaintiff meets all of the criteria for dismissal under Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919 (4th Cir. 1982).² Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed for lack of prosecution. See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Rule 41(b), Fed.R.Civ.P.

The Clerk shall mail this Report and Recommendation to Plaintiff at his last known address. If the Plaintiff notifies the Court within the time set forth for filing objections to this Report and Recommendation that he wishes to continue with this case and provides a response to the motion for summary judgment, the Clerk is directed to vacate this Report and Recommendation and return this file to the undersigned for further handling. If, however, no objections are filed, the Clerk shall forward this Report and Recommendation to the District Judge for disposition. Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989), cert. denied sub nom, Ballard v. Volunteers of America, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990) [Magistrate Judge's prior explicit warning that a recommendation of dismissal would result from plaintiff failing to obey his order was proper grounds for the district court to dismiss suit when plaintiff did not comply despite warning].³

²He is personally responsible for proceeding in a dilatory fashion, the Defendant is suffering prejudice due to having to expend time and resources on a case in which the Plaintiff is unresponsive, and no sanctions other than dismissal appear to exist as the Plaintiff is indigent (and therefore not subject to monetary sanctions) and he has otherwise failed to respond to Court filings despite Court orders requiring him to do so. Lopez, 669 F.2d at 920.

³After a litigant has received one explicit warning as to the consequences of failing to timely comply with an order of a Magistrate Judge, and has failed to respond to that order, the district court may, under Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(b), dismiss the complaint based upon the litigant's failure to comply with that court order. See Simpson v. Welch, 900 F.2d 33, 35-36 (4th Cir.1990); see also Ballard, 882 F.2d at 95-96 [holding that district court's dismissal following an explicit and reasonable warning was not an abuse of discretion].

The parties are referred to the Notice Page attached hereto.



December 21, 2017
Charleston, South Carolina

Bristow Marchant
United States Magistrate Judge



Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Robin L. Blume, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 835
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).